

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 13 and 16 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 6, 13 and 16 do not introduce any new subject matter.

Claims 1-5 and 9-12 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant notes that the Examiner maintains in the October 12, 2006 Office Action that "Applicant specifically stated in the interview on May 31, 2006 the intent of not requiring registers for the endian comparison in the method claims (Species II)."

Applicant indicated no such intent. In contrast, Applicant merely stated that the independent claims that do not recite registers were not limited to registers for comparison. See Examiner's Summary of the May 31, 2006 Interview. However, Applicant never maintained that the method claims excluded registers for endian comparison. Indeed, although independent claim 6 does not recite registers, claim 7, which depends from claim 6, recites that the first endian information is stored in a base address register.

AMENDMENT TO SPECIFICATION

Applicant has amended the specification to correct an inadvertent typographical error. No new matter is added by the amendment.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 6-8, 13-15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated U.S. Patent No. 5,867,690 ("Lee").

Applicant respectfully submits that Lee does not disclose or suggest that the first endian information is given by the value of a bit read from the at least one peripheral device, as recited in amended claims 6 and 13.

In addition, Lee does not disclose or suggest that the determination of whether second endian information of the computer system is identical with the first endian information of the at least one peripheral device is performed by comparing the value of a bit of the at least one peripheral device to the value of a bit of the computer system, as recited in amended claim 16.

For example, Applicant's disclosure states that a value "0" or "1" of a bit read from the first or second PCI card 220 or 230, represents little and big endian format, respectively. This value can be compared with a bit value of "0" or "1" of the computer system 200 representing little or big endian format, respectively. See, e.g., Applicant's disclosure, page 7, line 5 – page 8, line 11.

In contrast, Lee discloses that the byte-swapping device 530 selectively performs byte-swapping based upon whether or not the address on the address signals received by the byte-swapping device 530 falls within one or more ranges of contiguous byte addresses on the processor address bus 560. See Lee, col. 6, lines 42-50. Accordingly, unlike the claimed embodiments, the determination of byte-swapping is based on the comparison of an address to a range of contiguous byte addresses, not on the comparison of a value of a bit from a peripheral device and a bit from a computer system.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6, 13 and 16 are not anticipated by the cited reference.

For at least the reason that claims 7-8 depend from claim 6, and claims 14-15 depend from claim 13, claims 7-8 and 14-15 are also submitted not to be anticipated by Lee.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6-8, 13-15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicant's Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888